CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING & BUILDING DEPARTMENT
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 2010-007

1. PROJECT TITLE: Magnolia Oil Storage Tanks Demolition and Transfer Piping Removal

Concurrent Entitlements: Coastal Development Permit No. 2010-011

2. LEAD AGENCY: City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Contact: Hayden Beckman, Planning Aide
Phone: (714) 374-5317

3. PROJECT LOCATION: 21845 Magnolia Street (northwest of Banning Avenue and Magnolia Street intersection)

4. PROJECT PROPONENT:

Contact Person: Thomas McClane, Plains All American Pipeline, LP
5900 Cherry Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90805
Phone: 562-728-2358

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: P (Public)

6. ZONING: PS-O-CZ (Public-Semipublic – Oil Overlay – Coastal Zone)

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, approximately 2,342 linear feet of above-ground transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements at a former oil storage and pumping facility within the City of Huntington Beach (Attachment #2). The subject tank dimensions are described in Table 1.

Table 1
Huntington Beach Pump Station - Tank Description

Tank ID	Prior Contents	Tank Volume (Barrels)	Tank Dimensions
T1	Crude Oil	444,089	Diameter: 300' Height: 40'
T2	Crude Oil	406,766	Diameter: 300' Height: 40'
T3	Crude Oil	444,976	Diameter: 300' Height: 40'

Mechanized excavators equipped with concrete breakers, concrete munchers, grapples and other modern hydraulic demolition tools and attachments would be utitlized. Wherever possible, demolition and removal activities of the existing structures would occur using mechanized means and would include excavation activities to remove the above ground storage tank's concrete foundation structures. Excavation activities would be limited to site grading to an even level and removal of the above-ground tanks' and pump stations' foundation structures only. Subsequent sizing of scrap materials such as steel and rebar, and other material processing activities would take place at grade level, hauled off site, and recycled accordingly.

Project activities would include the following:

- Hand labor and small scale mechanized salvage operations to facilitate soft demolition of structurally non-essential materials including electrical wiring and equipment, tank wall lights, and girders located around the top of each tank.

- Utilization of excavators, cranes and track loading equipment to demolish all existing structures including three 40' high oil storage tanks, above ground transfer pipes, and two pumping equipment stations located on the eastern property line abutting the flood channel and along the northern property line.

- As demolition progresses, concrete and steel debris would be cleared by excavators and relocated to designated on-site debris pile locations.

- Clean concrete debris would be sized into manageable pieces and hauled off site for recycling or disposal.

- Metal debris such as structural steel framing, metal roofing and siding, reinforcing steel in concrete, copper tubing and electrical metal equipment would be sorted on site and recycled.

- All demolition debris that cannot be recycled or disposed of as a controlled waste will be loaded into trucks and hauled to a regional disposal facility for further recycling and landfilling.

- Upon removal of the above-ground storage tanks, transfer piping, concrete support structures and interior access roads, the project site would be graded to an even level.

The 41-acre project site currently features an approximately nine-acre greenbelt buffer along the Magnolia Street frontage. Behind this buffer, the applicant maintains an existing eight foot high interior perimeter fence separating most of the landscaped buffer area from the portions of the site dedicated to the former oil storage and transfer operations. Due to an existing grade differential, approximately one acre of the greenbelt buffer lies within the interior fence and the remaining eight acres outside of the fence, accessible from the public right of way. The width of the greenbelt ranges between 130 and 270 linear feet from the existing fence to the property line along Magnolia Street. All demolition would be conducted on the subject site within the interior confines of the existing fencing.

The facility previously operated as an oil storage and transfer station. It is currently a functioning facility, but used infrequently for oil storage. The project proponent does not propose any new uses or redevelopment of the site, and upon completion of the project, the site would remain vacant. Demolition and removal of the existing structures is anticipated to take two to three weeks total, with between seven and ten workers to operate machinery and organize removed materials to process and transport off site for recycling or disposal. Equipment and vehicles for the project activitites would be staged on the interior of

the site and not encroach into the public right of way. Grading of the site would take approximately two weeks and is anticipated to include fill in place of removed concrete foundations beneath each tank. Fill materials would be provided by existing on-site soil material and is not expected to include imported soils. All grading activities would occur once the above-ground structures and their support structures are removed.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The project site is located northwest of the intersection of Magnolia Street and Banning Avenue, approximately 1000 linear feet northeast of Pacific Coast Highway. The approximately 41 acre triangluated site is currently developed and was previously operated as a crude oil storage and transfer facility. The project site is bounded to the north by the Ascon Landfill (remediation of which is under evaluation by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control), single family residential uses to the east across Magnolia, and the Huntington Beach Channel along the south and west property lines. Across the Huntington Beach Channel to the south lies the Magnolia Marsh, and to the west is the AES power generating facility. The site is separated from the Huntington Beach Channel by a chain link fence and a gated maintenance road that is not part of the subject property. However, near the midpoint of the western property line abutting the Huntington Beach Channel, a bridge for oil transfer pipelines crosses the channel from the subject site to adjacent above ground storage tanks on the AES power generating station property to the west. This bridge will not be removed as a part of the proposed project.

The property is distinctly divided into two parts. Above ground crude oil storage tanks, ancillary transfer piping, support buildings and access roads constitute a majority of the site, approximately 32 acres total. This portion of the site is highly modified and essentially cleared of all vegetation. Each of the three above ground storage tanks is situated in an individual concrete-walled basin approximately six (6) feet deep, enclosed by berms of unconsolidated fine dirt. The tops of these berms are paved and provide vehicular access to the interior portions of the site. Various pipelines are located within the basins, but no structures lie within the berms beneath the interior access roads.

The remaining portion of the site exists as a landscaped greenbelt, approximately nine acres in size abutting Magnolia Street along the east and southern property line. This portion of the site is viewable from the public right of way, and mostly at grade level along the portions of the site that abut Magnolia Street. The greenbelt gradually slopes down towards the interior of the site where an existing chain link fence running the length of the gradient ridge separates the oil storage facility portion from the landscaped buffer. Dense vegetation along the ridge prevents direct public access to this fence. Some vegetation exists on the interior of the fence, but is not regularly maintained as a part of the greenbelt. Although no existing vegetation is proposed to be removed, site grading activities could result in the inadvertent removal of existing vegetation including portions of the greenbelt vegetation to the east of the existing interior wall.

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

No other environmental documentation has been prepared for this proposed project.

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED) (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement):

- General Construction Permit through the State Water Resources Control Board

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Transportation / Traffic	☐ Public Services
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Biological Resources	☐ Utilities / Service Systems
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Aesthetics
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☑ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Air Quality	☐ Noise	☐ Recreation
☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☑

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or a "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required.** ☐

Signature

11·29·10
Date

HAYDEN BECKMAN
Printed Name

PLANNING AIDE
Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.

6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.

7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach's requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures.

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The site is presently developed with a former oil storage and transfer facility. The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three existing crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, accessory structures, concrete support structures, and paved access roads contained within the site as well as associated site grading. New construction would not occur as part of the project. The City's zoning map and General Plan Land Use Element designate the site for Public and Semi-Public uses and the site lies within the Coastal Zone overlay. The proposed project is subject to approval of a Coastal Development Permit by the City of Huntington Beach, finding consistency with the approved Local Coastal Program and General Plan.

The proposed project would be consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and Local Coastal Plan:

Objective C 4.7 – Improve the appearance of visually degraded areas within the Coastal Zone.

Objective UD 2.2 – Minimize the visual impacts of oil production facilities and other utilities where they encroach upon view corridors or are visually incompatible with their surrounding uses.

Goal CE 7 – Maintain and enchance the visual quality and scenic views along designated corridors.

Policy ERC 3.1.3 – Ensure that mineral/oil resources production activities are compatible with adjacent uses by reviewing and applying appropriate conditions which:

(c) provide for the restoration and reuse of abandoned oil sites subject to the discretionary approval of the appropriate decision making body.

The project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the Local Coastal Program and General Plan listed above because the project would include the demolition and removal of three above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping and ancillary project activities only. Oil production and utility facilities are identified by the Urban Design Element of the General Plan as visual weaknesses that contribute negatively to the visual quality of the community. Implementation of the proposed project would eliminate the oil storage tanks' intrusion into the Pacific Coast Highway view corridor and prevent visual incompatibility with surrounding uses. The proposed project would not introduce new uses that would conflict with the identified policies and objectives contained in the General Plan. The subject property would be a vacant site following project completion.

With approval of a Coastal Development Permit, the project would not conflict with applicable planning documents and policies. New construction is not proposed as a part of the project request, and the project would not affect the development standards of the PS (Public Semipublic) zone. The impact would be less than significant.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project site is not located within an area designated as a wildlife habitat area. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as none exists in the City. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The subject site is located within an established urban area and does not propose any roads or features that would disrupt or physically divide an established community. Project activities would be confined to the existing site and no impacts would occur.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion a-c): The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements only. The project would not contribute to development of additional housing and would not generate population either directly or indirectly. The project would not displace any people and would not require any replacement housing. There would be no impact.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault ? (Sources: 1, 7)	☐	☐	☐	☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The project site is located in the Newport-Inglewood Fault zone, but not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies zone. The portion of the Fault that passes through the project site is identified as Category B. Category B faults require special studies for critical and important land uses and special evaluation of faults for all habitable structures. Since the proposed project does not include critical and important land uses or habitable structures, special studies and evaluations would not be required for the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 6, 7) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California and located in the Newport-Inglewood Fault zone. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Following removal of the facility, the interior portion of the property would be graded to a level elevation and remain thereafter as a vacant site. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial risk of loss, injury or death and impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 8) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site is located within an area identified by the City's Environmental Hazards Element of the General Plan as having a very high potential for liquefaction, and is located within a liquefaction zone according to Seismic Hazard Zone maps of the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Following removal of the existing facility, the interior portion of the property would be graded to a level elevation and remain thereafter as a vacant site. Pursuant to HBMC Section 17.05.150, a soil engineering and engineering geology report is required for grading projects. With adherence to applicable standards and recommendations included in the soil engineering and engineering geology report, impacts associated with seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction to people and structures on-site would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 8) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The site is currently developed and the interior of the project site is generally flat. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. An existing greenbelt running along the east and southeast portion of the lot currently features a grade differential of approximately 10 feet of a gradual slope. However, no portion of the site is listed as potentially unstable slope area according to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Environmental Hazards Element. Therefore, the potential for landslides at the facilities is low. Impacts would be less than significant.

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 8)

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The proposed project would include minor excavation to remove portions of existing foundation structures and footings of the storage tanks and piping and site grading activities. Most of this would occur where the soil surface is already covered by concrete, asphalt or gravel. Nonetheless, excavated soils could be subject to erosion, and so carried from the site through the City's storm drain system to offsite drainages, wetlands, and the Pacific Ocean. Wind erosion of excavation piles could also cause local nuisance dust. Implementation of standard erosion control techniques as required in Section 17.05.310 of the City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code (e.g., the use of Best Management Practices such as sandbags, covering of fill material, filter socks, etc.) would reduce the potential for soil erosion. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 8) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: As discussed, the project site has high potential for liquefaction, but is not listed as a potentially unstable slope area. The proposed project would be required to comply with HBMC Section 17.05.150, and a soil engineering and engineering geology report is required for grading activity. Recommendations included in the reports, subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works, are required to be incorporated in the grading plans or specifications. With adherence to applicable standards, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 8) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. No new construction is proposed as part of the project request. Based upon the City's General Plan and Geotechnical Inputs Study, the project is located within an area identified as having variable soil expansion. However, the proposed demolition project does not include structures that would be affected by expansive soils and would not create a risk to life or property. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The Department of Public Works would review and approve of a copy of the project applicant's Notice of Intent (NOI) as submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board, and a copy of the subsequent notification of the issuance of a Waste Discharge Identification (WDID) Number. Projects subject to this requirement are required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) conforming to the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works. Additionally, a Project Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) conforming to the current Waste Discharge Requirements Permit for the County of Orange prepared by a Licensed Civil Engineer would be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and acceptance. The WQMP would address all surface water quality issues with the remaining site once the proposed demolition project is completed. The WQMP and SWPPP are standard requirements for demolition in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, would ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, which would reduce project impacts to a level that is less than significant.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project does not include housing or commercial development or expanded areas that require irrigation. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Therefore, the project would not utilize substantial groundwater supplies. Moreover, the project would remove all impervious areas from the site. Thus, the project would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The impact with respect to depletion of groundwater supplies and interference with groundwater recharge would be less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project will not impact the course of a stream or river, as none exist on the site. The site currently abuts an existing Orange County flood control channel along the west property line. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The site has a closed drainage system and currently drains into the Huntington Beach Flood Control Channel, which abuts the property along the entire eastern property line for approximately 1785 linear feet. The existing greenbelt area above the grade differential drains toward Magnolia Street. Otherwise, water collected on-site that does not evaporate is pumped off-site by a series of transfer pumps to an outfall pipe that drains into the adjacent flood channel. Implementation of the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern onsite, as grading activities would reduce the interior of the site to a consistent grade level similar to its current characteristic. Additionally, removal of all impermeable surfaces on-site would increase permeability. Erosion and siltation could occur during demolition and grading activities; however, the City of Huntington Beach requires an erosion control plan for demolition and grading.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Therefore, with implementation of an erosion control plan during demolition and grading, impacts with respect to erosion and siltation would be less than significant.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount or surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site is currently mostly permeable and would not alter the course of a stream or river, as none exist on the site. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements only and would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff as all impervious areas would be removed and no new uses are proposed. Currently, any stormwater collected on site must be pumped off-site unless evaporated. See also discussion under item c). The proposed project would not result in an increased chance of flooding on or off-site, since the interior portion of the site not including the existing greenbelt would be graded to an even level, and the existing drainage pattern would not be substantially altered. As discussed above, the City of Huntington Beach requires an erosion control plan for demolition and grading activities which would ensure the existing off-site drainage pattern would not be adversely affected. The proposed project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of existing impervious surfaces on site which will increase permeablility and would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Following the removal of the facility, the project would not provide any additional sources of polluted runoff and impacts would be less than significant.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The Public Works Department requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared in accordance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations in order to control the quality of water runoff and protect downstream areas. NPDES requirements assure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The WQMP shall be submitted to the Public Works Department for review and approval prior to issuance of a demolition permit for the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project site is located within Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Zone X, which is not subject to Federal Flood Development requirements and is outside the 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

project does not include housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1, 14) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The proposed project site is designated as Zone X on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions. The project would remove all structures from the project site. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 14) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone, and is not in the immediate vicinity of a levee or dam. The project site abuts an Orange County Flood Control District flood channel along the western property line. However, the project does not include construction of housing or structures that would produce a significant risk of loss, injury, or death due to flooding or failure of a dam. Therefore, no impact would occur.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources:1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. According to the Moderate Tsunami Run-up Area map in the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the project site is located in a moderate tsunami run-up area. The project site has been under equal threat from tsunami water run-up since the establishment of the use. The project site is adjacent to an existing flood control drainage channel, and presents a negligible risk of seiche which would be present only in the event of an earthquake. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a vacant site and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to indundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Impacts would be less than significant.

k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Upon removal, the interior portion of the site not including the existing greenbelt area would be graded to an even level. This activity could expose earth materials to erosion and subsequently produce sediment-laden stormwater runoff from the project sites during demolition. However, the City of Huntington Beach requires an erosion control plan for demolition and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP). Approval of a SWPPP conforming to the current National Pollution Discharge Elmination System (NPDES) requirements would ensure compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Erosion control plans must be prepared by a licensed engineer and in accordance with provisions of the City of Huntington Beach Grading Manual. During demolition, and where necessary, temporary or permanent erosion control devices such as desilting basins, check dams, riprap, or other devices or methods as approved by the Public Works Department, shall be employed to control erosion and provide safety during the rain season. In addition, paved streets, sidewalks, and other improvements are required to be maintained in a neat and clean condition free of loose soil, construction debris, and trash. Compliance with City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code requirements would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1, 4) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Upon removal of the existing structures, there will be no new construction or uses on-site and the property would be vacant. Therefore, impacts will be less that significant. See also Section IV(a).

m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1, 17) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project has the potential to discharge stormwater pollutants from these activities during demolition. However, as discussed under Section IV(a), existing requirements would minimize potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from demolition-related activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1, 17) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site drains into the Huntington Beach Flood Control Channel, which ultimately discharges to the Pacific Ocean. As discussed, the proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface on the project site. Moreover, implementation of an erosion control plan and SWPPP during demolition would ensure that loose soil is not carried off-site in runoff and following demolition and grading activity, the WQMP would manage post-project water quality. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. Impacts would be less than significant.

o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

environmental harm? (Sources: 1, 4, 17)

Discussion: As discussed, implementation of the proposed project would reduce the amount of impervious surface on the project site. Additionally, the project would not increase the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff since the project would not significantly impact existing topography or drainage, and would result in no new uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1, 4, 8) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Although the project would alter flow of water on-site due to removal of the three existing oil storage tanks and transfer piping, this effect would be minimal. The project site features relatively flat topography with an elevated landscaped buffer. This greenbelt buffer features a grade differential that separates the greenbelt area along the westerly property line from the interior of the lot, separated by an existing 8 foot high fence. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the removal of this buffer or slope and the flow of water will not be redirected or impeded. Additionally, each of the above ground tanks sits within a concrete-walled basin approximately 6 feet high, surrounded by berms of unconsolidated fine dirt. The tops of these berms are paved to provide vehicular access around the site, and would be removed. Upon removal of the tanks, transfer piping and interior roadways, the site would be graded to an even level and would not create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site. The City of Huntington Beach requires an erosion control plan for demolition. Erosion control plans must be prepared by the engineer of record and in accordance with provisions of the Grading Manual. During demolition activities, where necessary, temporary or permanent erosion control devices such as desilting basins, check dams, riprap, or other devices or methods as approved by the Public Works Department, shall be employed to control erosion and provide safety during the rain season. Additionally, a post-demolition activity WQMP is required. Paved streets, sidewalks, and other improvements are required to be maintained in a neat and clean condition free of loose soil, construction debris, and trash. Street sweeping or other equally effective means is required to be used on a regular basis to prevent storm flows from carrying sediment and debris outside the project boundaries. Thus, compliance with City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code requirements would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

V. AIR QUALITY. The city has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 15) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 16, 17, 22)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion a) – e): The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Implementation of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; grading activities including the transport of any necessary soil import and/or export, delivery and hauling of demolition materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site demolition equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. Sensitive receptors within the vicinity of the subject site include a residential neighborhood located east across Magnolia Street. The total project duration is not anticipated to exceed one month and would not add new land uses or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Objectionable odors from operation of the demolition equipment may occur. Given that total project duration would be less than one month and odors would likely dissipate quickly, impacts from odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant. The project will not contribute to population growth and therefore, would not conflict with the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan adopted by the SCAQMD.

To reduce emissions, standard City requirements regulate operational construction conditions by requiring construction equipment be maintained in peak operating condition, the use of low sulfur fuel by weight, prohibiting truck idling for periods longer than ten minutes, and discontinuing construction activity during second stage smog alerts. The project is also required to comply with the SCAQMD Rule 403. Emissions during construction were calculated using URBEMIS2007 program (version 9.2.4). The allotment of equipment to be utilized during each phase was based on defaults in the URBEMIS2007 program and was modified as needed to represent the specifics of the proposed project. The default level of detail was used to calculate fugitive dust emissions from proposed activity on 32 acres of the approximately 41-acre site.

The URBEMIS model calculates total emissions, on-site and offsite, resulting from each construction activity which are compared to the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. A comparison of the project's total emissions with the regional thresholds is provided below. Standard Code Requirements such as watering and/or placing ground cover over exposed surfaces reduce fugitive dust impacts. A project with daily emission rates below the thresholds is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Construction Emissions SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	ROG	NOx	PM10	PM2.5	SOx
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	32.75	6.75	68.61	94.73	19.73	<1
Significance Threshold	550	75	100	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the table, demolition emissions from the proposed project would not substantially contribute to an existing air quality violation nor would it result in a cumatively considerable increase of non-attainment pollutants and ozone precursors such as carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter. Therefore a less than significant impact on air quality is anticipated. Additionally, following implementation of the project, no long term emissions are anticipated.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. On-site demolition activities would occur entirely within an existing perimeter fence and would not impede the existing transportation circulation system. However, the project may cause a temporary increase in traffic due to the transport of demolition equipment and materials to and from the project site, in addition to worker trips to and from the site. Total project duration is not anticipated to exceed one month and a maximum of ten workers would be driving to the project site on work days. A Haul Route Permit would be required, subject to approval of the Department of Public Works Transportation Division. The Haul Route Permit would include the approximate number of truck trips and the proposed truck haul route(s) for the export or import of material, and ensure compliance with applicable plans, ordinances and policies relating to the performance of the existing circulation system. In addition, the project does not propose new uses that would generate additional vehicle trips. Less than significant impacts would occur.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

(Sources: 4)

Discussion: As discussed above, demolition activities would occur entirely on-site and would not impede the existing circulation system. With approval of a Haul Route Permit, the project would not conflict with a congestion management program or exceed an established level of service standard established by Orange County for designated roads or highways. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project site is not located within five miles of a public or private airstrip and does not propose any structures to interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impact would occur.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: Access to the project site is currently provided by an approximately 200 linear foot driveway off of Magnolia Street. Access to the interior of the site is regulated by an existing vehicle gate at the terminus of the driveway, which provides safe access to all vehicles entering the site and a sufficient vehicle and equipment stacking area. All vehicles and equipment utilized for demolition activities would be parked or staged on site within the interior perimeter fence and would not impede traffic patterns. The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of a former oil storage and transfer facility. Implementation of the project will not result in new uses or development on the site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: All project related equipment and vehicles would be contained within the project site and would not impair emergency access to the site or surrounding properties. Less than significant impacts would occur.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. All project related vehicles would be parked on the site and would not use existing available on street parking in the vicinity. The oil storage and transfer use has ceased operation and no new uses or redevelopment of the site is proposed. No impacts would occur.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Sources: 4) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The proposed project would not remove, alter or impede any existing public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. No new uses are proposed that would require additional facilities. No impacts would occur.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S, Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 4, 18) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is presently developed with a former oil storage and transfer facility and a landscaped greenbelt dominated by mature ornamental plant species. Common native animal species frequently found in similar urban habitats in southern California are known to occur within the existing greenbelt area.

Excluding the existing greenbelt, much of the project site has been highly modified to its current state as an oil facility. Additionally, the project site is not depicted in the Coastal Element of the General Plan as an environmentally sensitive habitat area.The project applicant submitted an environmental site assessment prepared by MBC Applied Environmental Services dated May 2010 (Attachment #5). Two biologists conducted an initial reconnaissance of the project site that included observing and making note of local habitat features, plant species and occurrences of animals. Following observations within the interior fenced area of the oil storage facility, the consultants performed a similar survey along the greenbelt section of the site.

Thirty-three plant species, five insect, one lizard, nine bird and one mammal species with evidence of the presence of another mammal species were observed during the site survey. Because of the proximity of the site to the Huntington Beach Wetlands, survey biologists were attentive to the possibility of salt marsh habitat on the property. Southern coastal salt marsh is considered sensitive and very threatened according to the California Natural Diversity Database (2010). Alkali heath, a salt marsh plant species, was observed on the property, but occurs in low abundance within a limited area that was not considered to be a salt marsh habitat. Furthermore, the biologists also investigated the potential presence of two sensitive bird species, Belding's savannah sparrow and the California least tern, known to inhabit the nearby Huntington Beach Wetlands. No supporting habitat or foraging activity of either sensitive bird species was found during the survey.

The survey concluded that no Federal or State threatened or endangered species or habitats were present in the survey area according to current criteria set by the California Department of Fish and Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Additionally, the Environmental Resources/Conservation Element of the General Plan lists no observed plant or animal species as a sensitive element of biological diversity.

Implementation of the project would result in the demolition and removal of three existing oil storage tank structures, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements only. Although no existing vegetation is proposed to be removed, site grading activities could result in the inadvertent removal of existing vegetation including portions of the existing greenbelt vegetation to the east of the existing interior wall. However, this would not result in the removal of sensitive or special status species or their habitat, or mature, healthy trees. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 4, 18)

Discussion: Riparian and wetland habitat exists adjacent to the project site but is currently separated from the project site by the Huntington Beach Channel and would not be affected by the proposed project. As discussed above, the project site features an approximately nine acre greenbelt area which demonstrates an established community of both native and non-native flora and fauna. However, the greenbelt would not be removed or substantially disturbed with implementation of the proposed project. Impacts regarding adverse effects to wildlife resources or their habitat either directly or indirectly would be less than significant.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 4, 13) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project site is adjacent to the Huntington Beach Wetlands along the southeastern property line, but physically separated by the Huntington Beach Flood Control Channel. All demolition and grading activities associated with the proposed project will occur within the boundaries of the subject site. Additionally, project activities are subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department regarding water quality, erosion control and other applicable Best Management Practices to reduce impacts to surrounding properties and uses. The project would not involve any activities involving removal, fill, or interruption of federally protected wetlands. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 4, 18) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is currently developed and substantially altered to support an oil storage and transfer facility. According to an environmental site assessment of the subject property dated May 2010, no federal or state identified threatened or endangered species or habitats were present on the subject property. The subject property is located in a mixed urban and industrial use area, with nearby natural or recovering coastal habitats. Native vegetation and animal species exist on site within the greenbelt but none was observed within the interior portion of the property which houses the existing oil storage tanks and transfer piping. Implementation of the project would result in the demolition and removal of the existing structures on-site, but would not include the deliberate removal of any portion of the existing greenbelt. The proposed project would not interfere with established resident or wildlife corridors, on-site movement of native or non-native species as none occurs, and would not impede the use of any native wildlife nursery sites. Less than significant impacts would occur.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: As discussed above, the project site does not contain rare and unique plant or animal species. Additionally, the proposed project would not include the removal of any existing portion of the greenbelt or on-site trees, and therefore would not require compliance with current tree preservation policy or ordinances. No impacts would occur.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 4, 18) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project site is currently developed with a former oil storage and transfer facility featuring an existing greenbelt. As discussed, the project site does not support any unique or endangered plan or animal species and is not a part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts to a habitat or wildlife conservation plan are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The only mineral resources that are currently being extracted in the City are oil and gas. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The proposed project would not interfere with the extraction or restrict the availability of oil on the project site or within the City. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The proposed demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource site. The project site was previously an oil storage and transfer facility only, and is not designated as a known mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. No impacts would occur.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 13, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The subject oil storage tanks are empty and the site is currently decommissioned from its use as a fuel oil storage and transfer facility and no new use is proposed. The project would not involve routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impacts would occur.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 16, 19, 20, 21)	☐	☑	☐	☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is currently developed and was previously used for fuel oil storage and transfer purposes. Demolition activities would include the handling of hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead-based paints.

Two independent studies of the site have identified the storage tanks and portions of ancillary above-ground transfer piping as containing lead-based paint and asbestos, both of which were utilized as part of the original construction. J&M Environmental Control Group performed an asbestos sampling and assessment of the project site on May 18, 2010, and an X-Ray Flourescence Analyzer (XRF) Lead-Based Paint (LBP) sampling and assessment of the project site on May 19, 2010.

The asbestos sampling assessment collected bulk samples from various suspect Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) in order to determine the presence (if any) of asbestos fibers prior to demolition. The survey was performed in compliance with requirements of the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, and Cal/OSHA Asbstos Construction Standard Title 8 CCR 1529. Based on the survey results, J&M Environmental Control Group recommends that the asbestos containing materials be removed and disposed as non-friable ACM in accordance with the guidelines and procedures as described in SCAQMD Rule 1403.

Subsequently, the LBP assessment collected a total of 144 XRF samples from specific locations of the site where painted metal surfaces contained trace elements of lead. These sample locations included all painted components of the exterior girders from two of the three existing above ground oil storage tanks, tank discharge pipe, a manhole accessway pipe, tank body of the pumping pad, and two on-site fire hydrants. Compliance with Federal and State Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) regulatory requirements and removal by a Cal/OSHA-registered abatement contractor prior to demolition activities would reduce the potential for demolition related risks from the removal and transport of hazardous materials.

Additionally, CH2M HILL conducted a Phase I ESA (Environmental Site Assessment) for the entire Huntington Beach Generating Station in September 1996, and a subsequent Phase II ESA in June 1997. Updates to the 1996 Phase I ESA were completed in May 2000, which included the subject site and three subject above ground oil storage tanks. The 2000 report indicates that previous sampling results from the June 1997 Phase II ESA for the soil in the area of the subject tanks contained petroleum hydrocarbons at concentrations that may warrant further action. The documented presence of petroleum hydrocarbon impacted soil in the area of the aboveground storage tanks is considered a REC (Recognized Environmental Condition). At the time of the report, no further action was recommended for the subject tanks. However, the report suggested that additional sampling, agency negotiations, and/or remediation may be necessary or appropriate as a part of facility decommissioning.

The May 2000 Phase I ESA was completed in conformance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E 1527-97 – Phase I Assessment Standard Process. The primary focus of the Phase I ESA process was to identify recognized environmental conditions. As defined by ASTM, the term recognized environmental condition (REC) means:

"the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of release of any hazardous substance or petroleum products into structure on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term is not intended to include de minimis conditions that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environment and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies."

Furthermore, the 1996 Baseline Tank Study reported that soils contamination exists at all of the tank locations at a depth of approximately six inches. This contamination was estimated in the baseline report to not exceed a depth of one foot in the immediate area surrounding the tanks and directly beneath the tanks. The contamination is reported to be limited by the high viscosity of the oil stored in the tanks. Most of the oil contamination was reported to be from the use of oil as a corrosion inhibitor for the tank bottoms when they were installed. Laboratory test results for the study reported that the petroleum hydrocarbons on the soil are non-hazardous (the concentrations of CAM metals, limits of volatile organic compounds, and toxicity are all within Environmental Protection Agency guidelines for nonhazardous materials) and do not pose a health threat to the public. With regulatory approval, the report recommended that limited remedial action be conducted to remove and replace contaminated soils in accessible areas around the tanks and leave the remaining contamination in place for in-situ isolation, or remediation when the tanks are removed from the site. It should also be noted that no evidence of hazardous materials or petroleum product releases in the vicinity of on-site above ground petroleum pipelines was observed. The recommendations of the 1996 Baseline Tank Study and 2000 Phase I update are consistent.

The project site has been identified as containing potentially hazardous materials in the form of lead-based paints, asbestos, and hydrocarbon soils contamination. The potential upset of or accidental release of hazardous materials would be a potentially significant impact. However, with compliance with City specifications and OSHA and SCAQMD regulatory requirements, impacts from the release of hazardous materials (lead-based paints and asbestos), would be reduced to a less than significant level. Additionally, Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 is recommended to reduce potentially significant impacts from the release of hazardous materials due to on-site soil contamination to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the following shall be required:

- A soil testing plan conforming to *City Specification #431-92, Soil Cleanup Standards* shall be submitted to the Fire Department for review and approval. The testing results shall be jointly reviewed and approved by the Fire and Public Works Departments.
- A Remediation Action Plan (RAP) shall be submitted to the Fire Department based on requirements found in Huntington Beach *City Specification #431-92, Soil Cleanup Standards*. The plan shall include methods to minimize remediation-related impacts on the surrounding properties. Qualified and licensed professionals shall perform the remediation activities and all work shall be performed under supervision of the City of Huntington Beach.
- Closure reports or other reports acceptable to the Fire Department that document the successful completion of required remediation activities for the contaminated soils, in accordance with City Specification #431-92, shall be submitted to and approved by the Fire Department prior to issuance of grading permits.
- The applicant shall submit the RAP to other County or State agencies as necessary. The applicant shall coordinate other applicable agency permit and oversight requirements with the Fire Department.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The project would have a less than significant potential for adverse effects of hazardous materials to the public or the environment with implementation of existing requirements and Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: No existing or proposed school lies within one-quarter mile of the project site. However, an existing high school is located within approximately one-third of a mile from the project site. See item IV(a) and (b) above. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The following databases were checked (August 19, 2010) for known hazardous materials contamination at the project site:

- *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database;*
- *Geotracker search for leaking underground fuel tanks;*
- *Investigations- Cleanups (SLIC) and Landfill sites, Cortese list of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites; and*
- *The Department of Toxic Substances Control's Site Mitigation and Brownfields Database.*

The proposed project is not located on a site that has been included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or pubic use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion e) & f): Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center, Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public airport. In addition, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: See discussion under Section IX(e).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 21)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project site is currently developed with a former oil storage and transfer facility. The site does not feature any public access roadways or structures, and implementation of the proposed project would not add people or structures to the site. Upon demolition and removal of the storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping, the site would be graded to an even level and remain a vacant site. Therefore, no interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would result, and no impacts would occur.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. An approximately 9 acre portion of the site adjacent to Magnolia Street exists as a greenbelt buffer area intermittent with mature trees, shrubs, and low lying vegetation and is not considered a wildlands area. In addition, no designated wildlands areas are in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not expose persons or structures to wildfire hazard risks. No impact would occur.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 2)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion a) – d): The project is required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.40 Huntington Beach Municipal Code), which restricts the hours of construction. During demolition of the former oil storage and transfer facility, temporary and intermittent noise impacts due to demolition activities on-site could create noise in excess of established noise standards from mechanized vehicles and attachments typically used on industrial scale demolition sites. In addition, demolition of three existing above-ground oil storage tank structures, ancillary transfer piping, and other existing site improvements could potentially increase groundborne vibration or noise on the project site. However, Section 8.40.090(d) of the City Noise Ordinance states that construction noise is exempt provided it does not occur between 8PM and 7AM Monday through Saturday, or on any time on Sundays or Federal Holidays. The project would take approximately one month to complete and all demolition activities would occur within the interior of the site, behind a greenbelt buffer area separating the existing oil storage tanks and transfer piping area from sensitive residential uses across Magnolia Street. Additionally, the site would remain vacant upon completion of the demolition activities. Therefore, only short-term noise and vibration impacts associated with demolition activities are anticipated. With adherence to the City Noise Ordinance for hours of construction and given the temporary nature of the project, less than significant impacts would occur.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: See discussion under Section X(a).

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section X(a).

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 2) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: See discussion under Section X(a).

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 16, 21) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion e) & f): The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos. However, the site is located a considerable distance from the Training Center. In addition, the proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, does not include residential units, and would not involve people working at the project site following implementation of the project. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 21) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: See discussion under Section X(e).

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The Huntington Beach Fire Department reviewed the project and indicated that the project is required to comply with several Fire Department code requirements and specifications (refer to Section IX Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The project site is located within the area of five-minute response time

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

from the Magnolia and Bushard Fire Stations and is currently served by these fire stations. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project would not involve the addition of people to the project site and would not necessitate the construction of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the provision of which would have significant environmental effects. No impacts are anticipated.

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is located in an urbanized area and is served by the Huntington Beach Police Department. Implementation of the proposed demolition project would not involve the addition of people to the subject site, and would not necessitate the construction of new or physically altered police facilities, the provision of which would have significant environmental impacts. The project site currently does not provide public access to the interior of the site and perimeter landscaping and fencing would not be removed as part of the demolition activities. The site is currently fenced to prevent trespassing and will remain vacant following the proposed demolition activities which would not result in calls for service. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) Schools? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: Implementation of the project would not involve the addition of people to the project site. Therefore, the project would not affect schools in Huntington Beach. No impact would occur.

d) Parks? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three existing above ground oil storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping. The project is not anticipated to have any impact to park facilities since implementation would not include the addition of people to the project site. Thus, no impacts would occur with respect to parks in the City of Huntington Beach.

e) Other public facilities or governmental services? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three existing above-ground oil storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping. The project site is an existing decommissioned oil storage and transfer facility and during past operation of the site, all facilities needed to serve it were in place. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a vacant property devoid of any substantial demand for services. Additionally, the proposed project has been reviewed by various City Departments, including Public Works, Fire, and Planning and Building for compliance with all applicable City codes. No impacts to public services would occur.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion a) & b): The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Implementation of the project would not result in the addition of people or uses to the subject site and would not require new water or wastewater treatment facilities or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No impacts would occur.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: See discussion in Section XII(a).

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: Implementation of the project would not result in the construction of new or significant expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. No impacts would occur.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The proposed project would not involve the addition of people to the project site. Water would be utilized during demolition activities in order to comply with City code requirements and standards. However, implementation of the project would not result in any new water demand on-site. Therefore, impacts with respect to increased water demand would be less than significant.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: As discussed, the proposed project would not result in any new water demand on-site or involve the addition of people to the project site. Therefore, the project would not create demand for additional wastewater disposal. No impact would occur.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. An Asbestos Sampling and Hazard Assessment and a Lead Based Paint Inspection Report performed by J&M Environmental Control Group have indicated the presence of asbestos containing materials and lead based paints on existing structures on the project site. The identified lead based paint materials are required to be removed by a Cal/OSHA-registered abatement

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

contractor prior to demolition activities. Additionally, the asbestos containing materials are required to be removed and disposed as non-friable asbestos containing materials in accordance with the guidelines and procedures as described in SCAQMD Rule 1403.

Demolition of the structures, substructures, and ancillary transfer piping would produce ferrous and non-ferrous metal, concrete, and asphalt debris classified as solid wastes. Prior to removal from the site, concerete materials would be sized into manageable pieces, and metal materials including but not limited to structural steel framing, metal roofing and siding, reinforcing steel in concrete, electrical cable and gears would be separated and sorted on-site. Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal. Collected solid waste is transported to a transfer station where the solid waste is sorted and processed through a Materials Recovery Facility where recyclable materials are removed. The remaining solid waste is transported to the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on present solid waste generation rates. The project site would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity, and less than significant impacts would occur.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: As discussed above, the demolition and removal of a former oil storage and transfer facility would generate various solid wastes. The project would comply with regulations pertaining to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1, 13)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: See Discussion under Section IV(a).

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The existing 40' high oil storage tanks located on the subject property are visible from Pacific Coast Highway, identified as a Major Urban Scenic Corridor by the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Oil production and utility facilities are identified as visual weaknesses in the General Plan that contribute negatively to the visual quality of the community. Implementation of the proposed project would remove the existing oil storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping, thereby removing an identified visual weakness in the City. No impacts would occur.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: Implementation of the project would not damage any historic buildings or other scenic resources within a state designated scenic highway. No impacts would occur.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. North of the site lies the ASCON Landfill, remediation of which is under evaluation by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. To the east, the project site is buffered from sensitive residential uses across Magnolia Street by a landscaped greenbelt area. Pacific Coast Highway lies approximately 1000 linear feet from the southern portion of the subject property, which is bounded by the Huntington Beach Flood Control Channel. The project site is located adjacent to a power generating utility facility to the west which currently dominates the surrounding visual character. As discussed above, the subject oil storage tanks are visible from Pacific Coast Highway and contribute to the visual presence of the utility facilities along a designated Major Urban Scenic Corridor. Implementation of the project would remove the oil storage tanks from the subject site, eliminate their view from the surrounding area and Pacific Coast Highway, and preserve the greenbelt buffer area. Therefore, the project would improve the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three existing above-ground oil storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping. The project site previously operated as an oil storage and transfer facility which featured industrial type security lighting on the 40' high storage tanks. However, implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of these lights, and would not result in the creation of a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or night time views in the area. No impacts would occur.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project site is not listed as a historical resource in Table HCR-1 or a local landmark in Table HCR-2 of the City's Historic and Cultural Resources Element of the General Plan. The oil storage tanks and transfer piping do not meet the definition of a historical resource and no impacts would occur.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to δ15064.5? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The subject site, a former oil storage and transfer facility, is highly disturbed due to existing development of structures and piping equipment on and around the site. The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. Existing above ground structures feature below grade concrete support structures which would be removed and the materials processed for recycling or disposal. Following removal of the existing structures,

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

the project site would be graded to a level surface. The City of Huntington Beach, and subsequently the project site, lies within the area considered to have been occupied by the Gabrieliño culture group. Archaeological resources are frequently associated with riverine areas, such as those that historically occurred in the vicinity. However, there exist no recorded archaeological sites on or in the vicinity of the project site. Due to the existing developed nature of the site, the likelihood of encountering significant intact cultural resources is very low. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1,16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: As discussed above, the project site is highly disturbed due to existing development on and around the site. The subject site is not located within or adjacent to an identified paleontological site. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site unique geological feature. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no further analysis is required.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 16) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: No evidence is present to suggest that the presence of human remains exist on the project site given that the subject property is highly disturbed and the ground disrupted during prior site development activities. Therefore the likelihood of finding human remains is near negligible. Additionally, the project site is not located within or adjacent to an identified archaeological or paleontological site. Implementation of the proposed project would not disturb any human remains and no impacts would occur.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The proposed project would not add population to the City and therefore would not cause increased usage of parks. No impact would occur.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

Discussion: As discussed, implementation of the proposed project would result in the demolition and removal of a former oil storage and transfer facility. Upon completion, the site would remain vacant and no subsequent use of the site has been proposed. Additionally, the project would not result in the addition of population to the City and therefore would not result in a requirement to construct or expand recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No impacts would occur.

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The subject property is the site of a former oil storage and transfer facility. Demolition and removal of this facility would not result in development or new uses with the potential to affect existing recreational opportunities. Therefore, the project would not affect existing recreational opportunities and no impacts would occur.

XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion a) - c): The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project would have no effect on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. In addition, the project site is not zoned for agricultural development, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. The project would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact to agricultural resources would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: See discussion a).

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 16)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: See discussion a).

XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 17)	☐	☐	☑	☐

Discussion: The California Energy Commission calculated that in 2004, California produced 492,000,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions. On an individual basis, a project generally would not generate enough GHG emissions to create a significant impact on global climate change. The proposed project would result in a total of approximately 203 tons of CO_2 emissions, resulting from on site demolition, removal and grading activities. This represents a negligible amount when compared to the overall contribution of the State's GHG emissions impacting

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

global climate change. A project's potential impact would be its incremental contribution of GHG emissions when combined with all other GHG emission sources to cause significant cumulative impacts that could result in global climate change impacts. The proposed project has the potential to result in GHG emissions from both demolition and grading activities.

Demolition Emissions. The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of a former oil storage and transfer facility. Demolition activities are estimated to range from approximately 3 to 4 weeks. Implementation of the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions primarily due to the operation of demolition equipment and truck trips. Emissions associated with demolition activities were estimated using the California Air Resources Board's URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.4) computer model and the California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol (March 2007). The model estimates that approximately 9,059.34 lbs. per day of CO_2 could be released as a result of project activities. The largest source of GHG emissions during demolition could occur from demolition equipment exhaust and vehicle trips for demolition workers.

Indirect Emissions. Following project completion, the project site would remain vacant. Therefore, the project would not produce indirect emissions of Greenhouse Gases from the use of electricity, combustion fuels, or other sources associated with development.

The project would reduce GHG emissions through the removal of a former oil storage and transfer facility. Compliance with local, state and federal guidelines for demolition activity would reduce overall emissions by requiring construction equipment be maintained in peak operating condition, the use of low sulfur fuel by weight, prohibiting truck idling for periods longer than ten minutes, and discontinuing construction activity during second stage smog alerts. The project would not result in any additional vehicle or truck trips and associated emissions upon removal of the storage tanks and ancillary piping and cessation of on-site demolition activities.

While there is no specific threshold of significance for GHG emissions, it is reasonable to apply the same requirements for criteria pollutants in that significance occurs when a project results in a cumulatively considerable net increase of GHG emissions. Therefore, since the project's contribution of CO_2 emissions is minor, impacts from GHG emissions during demolition activities would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of GHG emissions and impacts would be less than significicant. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 17)	☐	☐	☐	☑

Discussion: See discussion a).

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	☐	☐	☑	☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The proposed project involves the demolition and removal of three above-ground oil storage tanks and ancillary transfer piping. The project site is currently developed and is not located within any wildlife or biological resource area. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact a fish, wildlife, or plant community. The site does not contain any historic resources. Based on discussions in Sections I to XVII, the project would not have significant impacts on the quality of the environment.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1, 2, 16) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: The project involves the demolition and removal of three empty above-ground crude oil storage tanks, transfer piping, and ancillary site improvements. The project does require mitigation for potentially significant impacts in the area of hazardous materials. However, all of the identified potentially significant impacts can be mitigated during and after project demolition and grading activities, and therefore do not represent a cumulatively considerable significant impact. Mitigation for impacts identified in the area of hazardous materials is due to the potential discovery of petroleum hydrocarbon soils contamination beyond what has been previously reported as a result of the storage of crude oil on the site, and not due to significant on-site contamination of other hazardous materials that would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. Project impacts are site specific and temporary (demolition, materials removal and grading activity) and would not contribute cumulatively considerable, incremental effects when viewed in connection with the effects of planned and pending development in the City. Therefore, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable significant impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1, 2, 16) ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐

Discussion: As discussed in Sections I to XVII, the project as proposed, with implementation of the recommended code requirements and conditions of approval, will have a less than significant or less than significant with mitigation (hazards and hazardous materials) impact on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

XIX. EARLIER ANALYSIS/SOURCE LIST.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

Reference #	Document	Available for Review at:
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning & Building Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 2000 Main St., 3rd Floor, Huntington Beach, and at www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/gp
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	"
3	Project Vicinity Map	See Attachment #1
4	Reduced Site Plans	See Attachment #2
5	Project Narrative	See Attachment #3
6	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	City of Huntington Beach Planning & Building Dept. (see #1)
7	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	"
8	City of Huntington Beach Geotechical Inputs Report	"
9	Geotracker search for leaking underground fuel tanks, 2010	http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/
10	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) database, 2010	http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/cursites/
11	Investigations- Cleanups (SLIC) and Landfill sites, Cortese list of Hazardous Waste and Substances Site	www.calepa.gov/sitecleanup/cortese
12	The Department of Toxic Substances Control's Site Mitigation and Brownfields Database, 2010	http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/
13	Project Implementation Code Requirements (October 20, 2010)	See Attachment #4

Reference #	Document	Available for Review at:
14	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (December 9, 2009)	City of Huntington Beach Planning & Building Dept. (see #1)
15	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	"
16	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	"
17	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (Oct. 17, 2002)	"
18	Environmental Site Assessment MBC Applied Environmental Sciences (May 2010)	See Attachment #5
19	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment CH2M HILL (May 2000)	City of Huntington Beach Planning & Building Dept. (see #1)
20	Asbestos Sampling and Hazard Assessment J&M Environmental Control Group (May 18, 2010)	"
21	Lead Based Paint Inspection Report J&M Environmental Control Group (May 19, 2010)	"
22	URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4 Report (October 12, 2010)	"
23	Summary of Mitigation Measure	See Attachment #6